

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 16, and 18 are independent. Claims 1, 5, 8, 13-16, and 18 are hereby amended. Claim 17 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter previously recited therein. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

In section 2 on pages 2-7, the Office Action rejects claims 1-14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0255028 to Chu et al. (hereinafter "Chu") in view of Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0172207 to Saito et al. (hereinafter "Saito"). In section 3 on pages 7-8, the Office Action rejects claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chu and Saito in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,838 to Squire et al. (hereinafter "Squire"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

As amended, independent method claim 1 recites a step of "using an association between each said VRF table and a respective sub-RIB" (emphasis added). Similar subject matter now appears in independent claims 16 and 18. Due to the incorporation of its subject matter into claims 1, 16, and 18, Applicant hereby

cancels claim 17 without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter previously recited therein.

The specification supports this subject matter throughout. As illustrated in Fig. 2, after a match is found, the matching route is retrieved from the sub-RIB and placed in the change list. Routes are put in appropriate sub-RIBs based on route target matches. See paragraphs [0033], [0044], and [0045]. As further shown in Fig. 3, all routes in the sub-RIBs that no longer match Import RTs are deleted. See paragraph [0047].

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Chu, the primary reference, does not “expressly disclose performing a route refresh operation only if a match is not found.” The Examiner then attempts to remedy Chu’s deficiencies by applying the teachings of Saito. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Saito’s router transmits a registration acknowledgement message if there is no address duplication, defining this action as a route refresh operation.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner correctly concedes that the combination of Chu and Saito does not teach “maintaining at said PE router a rejected routes tree comprised of routes that were not accepted during ImpRT filtering, wherein said step of searching is also performed on said rejected routes tree.” While the Examiner alleges that Squire teaches this subject matter, the Office never addresses the subject matter recited in claim 17, “further providing the

association between each said VRF table and a respective sub-RIB" (emphasis added). Applicant further notes that the Office Action is completely silent regarding sub-RIBs.

Applicant respectfully submits that Chu, Saito, and Squire do not disclose, teach, or suggest the above-quoted and described subject matter. None of these references disclose any information regarding sub-RIBs. As the references of record do not disclose sub-RIBs, Applicant respectfully submits that this subject matter is patentably distinct from the publications of record.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 16, and 18 are allowable. Claims 2-15 depend from allowable claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-15 are allowable at least on the basis of their respective dependencies upon allowable independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Application No: 10/775,214
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3118

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.

Date: October 16, 2008


Terry W. Kramer
Registration No.: 41,541

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802